UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 20 November 1991
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. PIBULSONGGRAM	(Thailand)
later:	Mr. SCHAFER (Vice-Chairman)	(Germany)

CONTENTS

PROGRAMME BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

AGENDA ITEM 72: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

91-57529 5328S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/46/SR.25
25 November 1991

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

PROGRAMME BUDGET IMPLICATIONS OF RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to a letter dated 14 November 1991 from the Controller addressed to the Special Political Committee on the programme budget implications of draft resolutions, which had been circulated as document A/SPC/46/4.

AGENDA ITEM 72: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/46/13 and Add.1, A/46/373, 399, 535, 536, 537, 538, 539, 540, 541 and 622; A/SPC/46/L.12-L.22)

2. Mr. AMIN-MANSOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) noted from the report of the Commissioner-General of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) that UNRWA had continued to extend its valuable assistance to the deprived people of Palestine despite difficult circumstances. The heroic Palestinian people continued to live under occupation in fear and tension, and had not yet been able to restore even its basic human rights, including self-determination and the right to a national homeland.

3. A complicated situation currently prevailed in the Middle East, and the constructive activities of UNRWA were obstructed by aggressive Israeli policies and arbitrary brutalities which were characterized as "routine" by Israeli forces. The details given in paragraph 4 of the Commissioner-General's report (A/46/13) regarding deaths, injuries and ill-treatment were self-explanatory.

4. Education was of vital importance in improving the cultural and scientific levels of the Palestinian people. His country, therefore, was greatly concerned about the future of Palestinian students, who were facing grave educational obstacles. During the reporting period, over 40 per cent of school days in the academic year had been lost, and instruction at the three Agency training centres in the occupied territories had been suspended for most of the months of January and February owing to the general curfew and periodic interruptions.

5. The inhumane practices of the Israeli forces had also affected virtually all UNRWA premises, as well as health centres in the occupied territories. Movement of the staff had been seriously affected by the frequent imposition of curfews and the designation of areas as closed military zones. There had been 618 incursions into Agency installations by members of the Israeli security forces in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and in the Gaza Strip alone, 132 instances of mistreatment of Agency staff members had been recorded.

6. It went without saying that UNRWA and its staff could not deal effectively with such difficulties, as well as those resulting from the

(Mr. Amin-Mansour, Islamic Republic of Iran)

Persian Gulf crisis, without the financial and political support of all countries and international organizations. For that reason, his country, despite the demands placed on its resources by its own reconstruction plans, continued to contribute $30,000 annually to UNRWA, and he was pleased to announce that the International Islamic University in Tehran was ready to grant scholarships to Palestinian students with a view to enhancing their scientific knowledge in various fields. His delegation also appreciated the cooperation of various international organizations, such as WHO, towards the achievement of UNRWA programmes.

7. Implementation of current programmes, such as income-generating initiatives, investment plans, distribution of self-instruction materials, socio-economic and welfare programmes and special hardship programmes, was of vital importance. His delegation sincerely hoped that UNRWA would succeed in carrying out those programmes, particularly those which would fundamentally strengthen the economic capability of the Palestinian people in the long term.

8. In conclusion, his delegation emphasized the necessity for the continuation of the Agency's work and the extension of its mandate. It was incumbent upon the international community, however, to take practical steps towards restoring the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including its right to security, self-determination and the establishment of an independent State in Palestine.

9. Ms. TRAORE (Mali) said that it was clear from the Commissioner-General's report that the treatment accorded to the Palestinian people in the occupied territories had not improved. The intifadah had continued, and by 30 June 1991, 998 Palestinians had been killed and more than 70,000 injured. The Gulf war had also contributed to a deterioriating situation in that it had caused a substantial loss of earnings and remittances from the Gulf and a decline in local economic activity. Furthermore, UNRWA had had to cope with the massive influx of displaced Palestinians into Jordan.

10. In carrying out its mission, the Agency had been confronted by administrative restrictions imposed by the countries in which it conducted its operations, including incursions into its premises and the arrest and harassment of its staff members.

11. At the same time, there had been improvements in certain regions which had recently come under the authority of the Lebanese central Government. Her delegation also welcomed the agreement recently concluded between the Agency and the Syrian Government concerning implementation of the Agency's programmes on behalf of the refugees.

12. Programmes in the fields of health, education and social assistance, in addition to emergency relief, were more essential than ever. In that connection, her delegation appreciated the Agency's efforts to provide schooling for young Palestinians, in addition to vocational and technical

(Ms. Traore, Mali)

training and scholarships for university education. It also welcomed the investment programme undertaken by the Agency with the aim of creating jobs for the population of the occupied territories.

13. Her delegation noted with approval the internal restructuring carried out by the Agency in connection with the deployment of its resources. It appealed to Member States to contribute to the expansion of the Agency's financial base to enable it to meet its ever-growing needs. For its part, Mali, which had always supported the cause of the Palestinian people, would spare no effort to make its own modest contribution to helping to alleviate the plight of the refugees.

14. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that there had been some encouraging developments, particularly in Lebanon, since the last annual report of the Commissioner-General had been discussed in the Committee. On the other hand, the situation of the Palestinians in the occupied territories and in Jordan had deteriorated, partly due to the Gulf war and its aftermath. In particular, tightened Israeli security measures had led to increased unemployment and a further weakening of the Palestinian economy in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

15. The intifadah, the Israeli response to it, and the Gulf conflict had put pressure on the carefully self-defined limits of UNRWA activities and had led to an expansion into the field of protection in its widest sense, to a revival of the "works" component of its mandate and to the provision of emergency relief assistance in the form of food distribution to all those in need, without regard to formal criteria. He noted with concern that the Israeli authorities had continued to be less than fully cooperative with Agency operations and staff.

16. The increased demands made on UNRWA, in addition to demographic developments, made the soundness of the Agency's financial situation a goal of paramount importance. For its part, Austria had reacted quickly and had almost tripled its regular contribution in 1991 to $US 500,000, and had made a special contribution in the amount of $US 1 million to help cover the costs faced by UNRWA in accommodating additional Palestinian refugee children who had arrived in Jordan due to the Gulf conflict. His delegation noted with concern and consternation, however, that the donor base of UNRWA continued to be narrow, in particular with regard to countries from the region in which the Agency operated.

17. The fact that UNRWA, while successfully continuing to educate and prepare the Palestinians for a better future, still had to feed and shelter them and provide for their health needs, was a disturbing reminder of what had gone wrong in the region and of the failure both of the peoples of the region and of the international community as a whole to solve a problem that continued to undermine peace and security. He joined others in expressing the hope that the peace process currently under way would soon lead to a relaxation of tensions and an atmosphere of greater mutual trust and confidence.

18. Mr. PAULSEN (Chile) said that UNRWA was neccessarily a transitory agency, even though it had for 40 years attended to the basic needs of Palestine refugees through four wars and other civilian and armed upheavals caused by the unresolved political problem in the area, and although it would have to continue making long-range plans, in view especially of the demographic factors complicating the situation of the Palestinian people. The Commissioner-General of UNRWA had put forward some worthwhile ideas about the work that UNRWA could perform during that transitional period in the event that the encouraging peace process recently initiated in Madrid led to a transitional system of Palestinian self-rule. The peace negotiators would undoubtedly focus primarily on the sectors in which UNRWA had been most active - education, public health, social services and relief services - and would give them priority in the process of transferring power to the Palestinian community.

19. The Gulf crisis had presented a great challenge to UNRWA because of the exodus of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians to Jordan and because of the deteriorating economic and social situation of the Palestinians in the occupied territories. UNRWA had met that challenge well. The improvement of the internal situation in Lebanon would give UNRWA broader operational latitude in resolving some of the pressing problems of the Palestinian refugees in that country. Moreover, it was encouraging to learn that the financial situation of UNRWA was in 1991 on a relatively firm footing. Chile was responding to the Commissioner-General's appeal by again making a $5,000 contribution to UNRWA for 1992.

20. The Agency's technical and vocational training programmes for Palestinian refugees, whose human potential was fully recognized and utilized in the region, had been particularly successful, and Chile urged it to continue broadening its assistance in the areas of health, environmental hygiene, nutrition and other basic services.

21. His delegation would support all measures promoting a more coordinated and efficient management by the various United Nations agencies of programmes benefiting the Palestinian community, a goal that would no doubt be facilitated because of the atmosphere of détente and mutual trust generated by the Madrid peace process. A just and lasting solution must be found to the question of Palestine, the crux of the Middle East problem, on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). That would entail the withdrawal of Israel from the territories occupied since 1967, respect for the right of all States in the region, including Israel, to live within secure and internationally recognized borders, and the exercise by the Palestinian people of its legitimate right to self-determination.

22. Mr. AL-SABAH (Kuwait) said that his delegation supported the idea contained in paragraph 19 of the report of the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA (A/46/622) of holding an international information day on UNRWA to make the Agency better known and with the aim of broadening its financial support. Regarding the suggestion that the wealthier Governments in the

(Mr. Al-Sabah, Kuwait)

region should be encouraged to increase their contributions, he felt that support of UNRWA was the responsibility of the international community as a whole and should not be restricted to certain countries or regions. The establishment of UNRWA in 1949 had been seen as a temporary measure until such time as the Palestinian problem could be solved. Since then, the number of refugees registered with the Agency had grown from three quarters of a million to 2.5 million, placing a correspondingly greater economic and moral responsibility on the international community to support the Agency in its humanitarian tasks. Following the normalization of the situation in Lebanon, his delegation requested the return of UNRWA to its original headquarters there. His Government, which had given increasing support to UNRWA, starting even before Kuwait had joined the United Nations, proposed to increase its contribution in the current year to $US 1.5 million in order to alleviate the burden shouldered by the Agency in providing its services to Palestine refugees. Kuwait supported the right of the Palestinian people as a whole to return to its land and its inalienable right to self-determination. Kuwait also supported all international efforts aimed at finding a just and lasting solution to the Palestinian question.

23. Mr. PODTSEROB (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the current year's discussion of UNRWA was taking place in a new atmosphere of hope for a long-awaited settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict following the Madrid peace conference. The Soviet Union had always supported the convening of such a forum on the Middle East. An end must be put to the decades-long tragedy of the 4 million-strong Palestinian people, whose right to self-determination the Soviet Union supported. He hoped that the talks would bring the parties to a historic compromise. Those momentous political shifts obscured the tremendous humanitarian role played by UNRWA in providing assistance to the Palestine refugees. During the period covered by the report, the human rights situation had remained tense and there had been severe acts of repression against Palestinians in the occupied territories. The Gulf crisis had laid an additional burden on UNRWA, which had had to provide emergency assistance to hundreds of thousands of persons fleeing to Jordan. Throughout that period, UNRWA had never ceased to fulfil its regular humanitarian mission. His delegation found the persecution of UNRWA staff members and the violation of UNRWA premises by Israeli forces inadmissible and contrary to international law. He was confident that UNRWA would continue to carry out its noble tasks and hoped that the day would soon come when the Special Political Committee could consider that those tasks had been fully accomplished and that a settlement of the Middle East conflict had led to the disappearance of the reasons for which UNRWA had been established in 1949.

24. Mr. KIRSCH (Canada), speaking on behalf of the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and his own country, said it was profoundly regrettable that political circumstances had required the "temporary" mandate of UNRWA to continue for more than 40 years. Australia, Canada and New Zealand had strongly supported recent efforts aimed at bringing about a just, lasting and comprehensive solution to the Palestinian problem and security for all States

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

in the region, and they accordingly welcomed the Madrid peace conference and had been impressed by the note of optimism in the Commissioner-General's statement to the Committee introducing the annual report of UNRWA.

25. While it was to be hoped that the Agency could one day be dissolved, it continued to provide essential education, health and relief services to the Palestinian refugees living in Lebanon, Syria, Jordan and the occupied territories. The Agency had performed very capably in a year which had seen dramatic new burdens added to its already strained resources. In particular, UNRWA had proved to be a helpful partner in the international relief efforts for the wave of evacuees from Kuwait into Jordan, and cooperation between the Jordanian Government and UNRWA had been much appreciated, in that it had enabled relief to reach those in dire circumstances. The Agency was also to be commended for its food distribution in the occupied territories in early 1991, when the effect of curfews during the Gulf war had brought economic life to a standstill and reduced remittances from Gulf States had brought new hardships to Palestinians. It had also coped well with the influx of children of Palestinian refugee families from the Gulf into UNRWA schools and health services in Jordan, the occupied territories and Syria. In making increased contributions to UNRWA over the past year, the Governments of Australia, Canada and New Zealand acknowledged both the extra demands placed on the Agency and the fact that it had coped very well in diverting resources to meet those emergencies.

26. In regard to Lebanon, the Governments on whose behalf he spoke welcomed the rapid progress towards peace and national reconciliation, and hoped that such a trend would continue, thereby affording UNRWA personnel greater safety and mobility and enabling the Agency to address the problems of disrupted schooling for a generation of Palestinian refugee children. They therefore also hoped that the Government of Lebanon would in the near future devote increased attention to the question of the social and economic rights of Palestinian refugees living in that country.

27. Turning to the work of UNRWA in the occupied territories, he said that the Agency had continued to operate in an atmosphere of tension and violence. Following the tragic events on 8 October 1990 in Jerusalem, the international community had welcomed its work in providing protection and legal assistance to Palestinians, and also the efforts made by the refugee affairs officers.

28. The atmosphere engendered by the Madrid peace conference gave grounds for hope that the situation in the occupied territories could improve rapidly. The three Governments had consistently maintained that the Fourth Geneva Convention should be applied de jure to those territories, and that Israel should comply fully with its provisions. Contraventions, including deportations and administrative detentions of Palestinians and demolition of housing, had disrupted the economic and social life of Palestinian society and increased the burden falling on UNRWA hospitals, clinics and schools.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

29. The three Governments wished to reiterate their concern at the frequent failure to recognize the Agency's privileges and immunities, a factor which limited freedom of movement and affected operations. While incursions into UNRWA premises had somewhat abated, they still occurred too frequently. The resort to violence, whether by Israeli forces in the occupied territories or by Palestinian elements against Israeli citizens or within the Palestinian community itself, was also deplorable.

30. UNRWA continued to face delays and obstacles in implementing its construction programme in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. The Commissioner-General had noted that the situation had eased to some extent, although projects for which donors had already committed funds were still held up. The result of a marked reduction in administrative hindrances would create badly needed jobs for the Palestinian population and permit UNRWA to use its very limited resources in a timely and efficient manner.

31. In the past year UNRWA had given evidence of an increased commitment to income-generating projects. Given the deplorable economic situation within the occupied territories, efforts to promote small and medium-sized projects, creating very necessary employment, were very much welcomed by the three Governments. The Agency's innovative approaches to assist local Palestinian entrepreneurs, with revolving loan schemes, were particularly noteworthy.

32. Australia, Canada and New Zealand also welcomed the increased commitment by UNRWA to projects concentrating on programming for women. They had encouraged development of Agency policy to integrate planning for women's issues within the programming process and they would look forward to progress on that issue.

33. The international community had an obligation to provide UNRWA with the financial and political support it needed to meet new challenges. Unfortunately, such support had so far not proved forthcoming. Australia, Canada and New Zealand, despite domestic budget restrictions, had maintained their level of voluntary contributions and had responded to special appeals over the past year. In particular, he wished to point out that Australia's funding to the UNRWA core budget for 1991 was $US 2.5 million, representing a 5.3 per cent increase over the previous year. That had been supplemented by contributions of $US 500,000 to the Emergency Programme and $US 372,000 provided to Palestinians through grants to an Australian non-governmental organization. Australia's contribution to the core budget would rise to $US 2.6 million in 1992. For its part, New Zealand had contributed $US 200,000 to the core budget in the period July 1990 to June 1991, representing a 60 per cent increase over the previous year's allocation: that new level of funding would be maintained for the year 1991-1992. Canada's core funding to the 1991 budget of UNRWA totalled $US 10.5 million, in addition to contributions of $US 250,000 for income-generating programmes and a further $US 150,000 for women's projects. Canada could confirm that it would maintain its current level of funding for UNRWA.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

34. The three Governments called upon States represented within the Special Political Committee to provide the funding which UNRWA would continue to need to fulfil the obligations with which it was entrusted. For their part, they would continue to work closely with UNRWA to ensure that its administrative and budgetary procedures were conducted in the most efficient manner possible.

35. In conclusion, he said that the Agency's work often placed its staff in danger: it was imperative that its humanitarian role and the status of its international staff be respected and protected by the authorities in all areas in which it operated.

36. Mr. AL-ZAYANI (Bahrain) said that UNRWA had been established in 1949 as a temporary measure to meet the basic needs of the Palestine refugees. The non-implementation of General Assembly resolution 194 (III), which provided for the return of the refugees to their homes or compensation for those who did not wish to return, meant that the Agency had become permanent, continuing to play its noble humanitarian role despite its limited resources. Indeed, UNRWA had always shown ingenuity in overcoming material obstacles and ensuring that its basic programmes were carried out even while accepting urgent additional tasks.

37. It was apparent from the Commissioner-General's report that Israel had continued to repress the intifidah through killings, destruction of property, the razing or closure of buildings and arbitrary arrests. In one of the most tragic events, on 8 October 1990, 17 Palestinians had been killed and more than 150 wounded by Israeli security forces in the Haram al-Sharif, which had led to Security Council resolution 672 (1990) condemning those actions and resolution 681 (1990) requesting the Secretary-General to monitor and observe the situation regarding Palestinian civilians. As recently as 18 November 1991 it was reported that Israeli police had stormed the Shariah Court building in Jerusalem and seized documents.

38. The reports of the Commissioner-General and the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA indicated that the Agency's financial condition had been relatively healthy in 1991 and that UNRWA had received sufficient funding to deliver the essential parts of its programmes in 1990. However, both the Commissioner-General and the Working Group were concerned about the funding prospects for 1992. Efforts to ensure a greater flow of funds should therefore be intensified. The Working Group's suggestion of holding an international information day might help to broaden the base of financial support. UNRWA would remain a necessary institution until a just and lasting solution was found to the problem of Palestinian people. With the normalization of the security situation in Lebanon, his delegation supported the return of UNRWA to its headquarters at Beirut.

39. Mr. TURKMEN (Commissioner-General, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) said that he wished to express his appreciation on behalf of UNRWA for the Committee's constructive debate on the

(Mr. Turkmen, UNRWA)

item under consideration. The greatest strength for an organization such as UNRWA was to be able to count on the support and confidence of Member States.

Consideration of draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.12 to L.22

40. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that Turkey had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.13 and that Comoros had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.15 to L.22. He also drew attention to a typographical error in draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12: in the first line of the first preambular paragraph the correct resolution reference should read "45/73 A".

41. Ms. TAHIR-KHELI (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12, said that the United States was again pleased to sponsor the annual resolution on assistance to Palestine refugees. The United States was very concerned about the Palestinian refugee situation and was strongly supportive of UNRWA, whose humanitarian programmes provided vital educational, medical and relief services. It commended the response of UNRWA to the emergency needs of refugees displaced by the Gulf conflict and those affected by violence in Lebanon or by unrest in the occupied territories. To enable UNRWA to carry out its humanitarian mission, there must be strong financial support from the international community, and the United States implored other countries to donate generously.

42. Mr. BAS BACKER (Netherlands), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.13 on the Working Group on the Financing of UNRWA, reviewed the provisions of the draft text, which put particular emphasis on the extraordinary efforts that must continue to be made in order to maintain UNRWA activities at least at their present level and enable the Agency to carry out important construction and emergency programmes as well. Events in the Middle East were likely to generate further claims on its funds in coming years. The sponsors of the draft resolution felt that the Working Group should continue its commendable work, and expressed the hope that the Committee would adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

43. Mr. HIDE (Sweden), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.14 on assistance to persons displaced as a result of the June 1967 and subsequent hostilities, said that its objective, as in past years, was to endorse UNRWA efforts in that connection. It contained a strong appeal for generous contributions for that purpose. The sponsors were confident that it would be approved by consensus.

44. Mr. CHOWDHURY (Bangladesh), introducing on behalf of the sponsors draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.15 on offers by Member States of grants and scholarships for higher education, including vocational training, for Palestine refugees, L.18 on return of populations and refugees displaced since 1967, L.19 on revenues derived from Palestine refugees' properties and L.21 on the University of Jersusalem "Al-Quds" for Palestine refugees, drew attention

(Mr. Chowdhury, Bangladesh)

to the main points of those resolutions and said that Bangladesh greatly valued the important work being performed by UNRWA in providing education, health and relief work to the Palestinian refugees, but at the same time hoped that its work could be terminated as soon as possible, following a just and lasting solution to the Palestine problem.

45. Bangladesh had repeatedly stressed its anguish at the desperate plight of its Palestinian brethren and welcomed the recent Middle East peace conference begun at the initiative of the United States and the Soviet Union. A lasting and durable settlement must include the exercise of the Palestinian people's right to self-determination.

46. The draft resolutions did not differ from those adopted at the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and Bangladesh urged all delegations to support them.

47. Mr. FAZL-I-MAHMOOD (Pakistan), introducing, on behalf of the sponsors, draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.16 on Palestine refugees in the Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967, L.17 on resumption of the ration distribution to Palestine refugees, L.20 on protection of Palestine refugees and L.22 on protection of Palestinian students and educational institutions and the safeguarding of the security of the facilities of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East in the occupied Palestinian territory, reviewed their content and expressed the hope that they would receive the overwhelming support of the Committee, particularly at a time when the situation in the occupied territories had deteriorated considerably. It was the presence of UNRWA that enabled the people of Palestine to avail itself of a minimum of education, health and relief services, and the Agency therefore needed the full assistance of the international community in alleviating the suffering of the Palestinian refugees.

48. He drew attention to an oral revision in paragraph 4 of L.20. In the first line, the words "in consultation with" should be replaced by "and", and in the third line, the word "his" by "their".

49. Mr. PODTSEROB (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his Government's approach to reaching a Middle East settlement remained unchanged. The Soviet Union considered it inappropriate to adopt draft resolutions that dealt with subjects discussed at the Madrid peace conference on the Middle East, and would therefore abstain on draft resolutions L.18, L.19, L.20 and L.21. Needless to say, it was essential to continue the positive work of UNRWA, and in that context, his delegation supported all other resolutions under agenda item 72.

50. Ms. TAHIR-KHELI (United States of America) said that her Government supported draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12 on assistance to Palestine refugees and reaffirmed its continued commitment to the Agency's vital educational,

(Ms. Tahir-Kheli, United States)

medical and relief services. The United States was also pleased to join in the traditional consensus on draft resolutions A/SPC/46/L.13 and A/SPC/46/L.14.

51. Each year, many of the other resolutions submitted under the agenda item under consideration were highly politicized and contained sweeping, unbalanced criticism of Israel's treatment of refugees or made proposals that the United States regarded as financially unsound. Such resolutions made no practical contribution to UNRWA objectives and only served to exacerbate tensions in an already difficult atmosphere in the occupied territories. For those reasons, despite its basic support for UNRWA, her delegation would vote against those resolutions.

52. The United States supported draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.15, which represented a practical approach to meeting the needs of refugees for higher education. However, it had reservations regarding paragraph 5 on the proposed Jerusalem University "Al-Quds", which it did not endorse.

53. Her delegation could not support draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16, which referred to an inalienable right of return while making no mention of the ongoing negotiations for comprehensive and lasting peace among the concerned parties. Moreover, the draft resolution requested the Secretary-General, in cooperation with the Commissioner-General, to resume issuing identification cards to all Palestine refugees and their descendants in the occupied territories. In the view of her delegation, the Commissioner-General should retain the authority to administer UNRWA programmes without such outside interference. The United States opposed such measures as the destruction of dwellings in the occupied territories, which were inconsistent with international law, but her Government would not object in principle to the concept of free relocation of those refugees who themselves sought new and better housing.

54. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.17, the United States had traditionally opposed that measure because, once again, it attempted to usurp the authority of the Commissioner-General to take decisions regarding how best to administer UNRWA programmes. Her delegation respected the judgement of the Commissioner-General that the real need for general ration distribution had ended and its continuation would adversely affect financing of other high-priority programmes.

55. The United States objected to draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.18 because it reaffirmed the "inalienable right of all displaced inhabitants to return to their homes or former places of residence", again without reference to the ongoing direct negotiations among the parties concerned.

56. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.19 also harshly criticised Israeli policy and requested that the Secretary-General establish a fund on behalf of displaced Arab property owners, for receipt of income derived therefrom. Her Government

(Ms. Tahir-Kheli, United States)

opposed that measure because, once again, it sought to prejudge the question of refugee compensation outside the context of a negotiated settlement.

57. Concerning draft resolution A/SPC/46/20, which urged the Secretary-General and the Commissioner-General to take measures to guarantee the safety and security and the legal and human rights of the Palestine refugees in the occupied territories, that would clearly exceed the UNRWA mandate. When a similar resolution had been considered in 1982, the United Nations Legal Counsel had pointed out that Israel, as the occupying Power in the West Bank and Gaza, had the authority and the responsibility to maintain security in the area. The United States was firmly on record that Israel must carry out those obligations in strict accordance with the pertinent provisions of the Geneva Convention of 1949.

58. The United States strongly supported practical efforts designed to promote educational opportunities for Palestinian refugees, but was constrained to oppose draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21, which represented an unreasonable and unworkable approach to the problem. It was not practical or appropriate for the General Assembly to involve itself in decision-making concerning the establishment of such an institution.

59. The United States felt compelled to vote against draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.22. Her Government was deeply concerned over school closures and disruption of UNRWA activities in the West Bank and Gaza, and had raised the matter on numerous occasions with the Government of Israel. The United States objected, however, to the harsh condemnation of Israel in that text. Her delegation had made it clear on numerous occasions that it would not support extreme or unbalanced resolutions of that kind. That was particularly true in the period ahead, when efforts were being made to build on the progress in the Arab-Israeli peace process begun at Madrid and to foster an environment conducive to serious negotiations and the achievement of real peace.

60. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic,

---

* The Rwandese delegation announced at the 26th meeting that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12.

Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

61. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.12 was adopted by 119 votes to none, with one abstention.

62. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the following information had been provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.13:

"Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.13, it would request the Secretary-General to provide necessary services and assistance to the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East for the conduct of its work.

"Provision is already made for substantive services to the Working Group under subprogramme 1 (Security Council and political committees activities) under section 3 (Political and Security Council affairs) of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993. As regards conference servicing requirements, it is assumed that ten meetings would be held in New York during 1992, but that services would be provided for these meetings on an 'as available' basis, so that related requirements would be met from within the permanent capacity of the Department of Conference Services. On this basis, no additional costs would arise and no additional appropriations would be required."

63. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.13 was adopted without a vote.

64. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.14 was adopted without a vote.

65. A recorded vote was taken on resolution A/SPC/46/L.15.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

66. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.15 was adopted by 121 votes to none, with one abstention.

67. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the following information had been provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16:

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.15.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.15.

(The Chairman)

"In his report on this subject, contained in document A/46/536 issued on 9 October 1991, the Secretary-General had indicated that he was unable at that time to comply with the request to resume the issuance of identification cards to all Palestine refugees and their descendants, contained in paragraph 3 of General Assembly resolution 45/73 E, and that in accordance with the current practice, all refugee families registered with UNRWA receive registration cards which are issued by the Agency. It was further indicated in that report that the Commissioner-General did not have the means to issue identity cards.

"The Secretary-General regrets that he is still unable to comply with the request contained in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16.

"Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16, the Secretary-General would, however, keep the situation under review to see whether appropriate documentation regarding the registration status of individual members of refugee families could be issued."

68. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand,

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16.

Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Zaire.

69. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16 was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 2 abstentions.

70. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.17.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.17.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.17.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Hungary, Liechtenstein, Poland, Romania, Spain, Zaire.

71. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.17 was adopted by 88 votes to 22, with 13 abstentions.

72. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.18.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

73. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.18 was adopted by 89 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.18.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.18.

74. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.19.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zaire.

75. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.19 was adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.19.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.19.

76. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.20, as orally revised by the sponsors.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

77. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.20, as orally revised, was adopted by 117 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

78. The CHAIRMAN informed the Committee that the following information had been provided by the Programme Planning and Budget Division in connection with draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21:

"In his report on this subject, contained in document A/46/540, the Secretary-General has indicated that, in order to comply with the request addressed to him in operative paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.20.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.20.

(The Chairman)

45/73 J, and reiterated in operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution, it will be necessary to complete the functional feasibility study initiated in pursuance of previous General Assembly resolutions. He has also indicated that it has not proved possible to complete this study as planned.

"Should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21, the Secretary-General continues to believe that implementation of the request contained in operative paragraph 2 would require completion of the functional feasibility study on the proposed university at Jerusalem. Since at present this does not appear possible, the Secretary-General is not in a position to foresee related programme budget implications. Should the situation change during 1992, the Secretary-General would propose to initiate action under the procedures for unforeseen and extraordinary expenses. Proposals for further action and related estimates would be put before the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session in the context of the report requested in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution."

79. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname,

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21.

Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Estonia, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zaire.

80. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.21 was adopted by 114 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

81. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.22.

In favour*: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Romania, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

---

* The Cuban and Rwandese delegations announced at the 26th meeting that, had they been present during the voting, they would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.22.

The delegation of Djibouti later informed the Secretariat that, had it been present during the voting, it would have voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.22.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire.

82. Draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.22 was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with one abstention.

83. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria), speaking in explanation of vote, said that his delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/46/L.16, on the understanding that the request addressed to the Commissioner-General in paragraph 2 and the request addressed to the Secretary-General in paragraph 3 would take into account the Agency's actual ability to comply with the requests.

84. Mr. BAS BACKER (Netherlands), speaking on behalf of the 12 member States of the European Community, said that the negative votes they had cast on some of the draft resolutions must in no way be regarded as limiting their support for UNRWA. They also wished to underscore their concern over the continued uncertainty of the funding for UNRWA. While the Twelve supported on humanitarian grounds the development of the various services UNRWA could provide, they had doubts about the advisability of placing unrealistic demands on the Commissioner-General.

85. Mr. AMIN-MANSOUR (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that although his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions, it had some reservations. In principle, it could not accept any term that implicitly or explicitly indicated recognition of the Israeli regime.

86. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine) thanked all who had voted in favour of the draft resolutions just adopted. The Palestine Liberation Organization interpreted those votes as massive international support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people to attain their national rights.

87. Mr. YARDEN (Israel) asked whether it was proper procedure for an observer to speak in explanation of position after a vote.

88. The CHAIRMAN explained that the observer for Palestine had spoken on the basis of General Assembly resolutions 3237 (XXIX) and 43/177.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.